Remarks

Claims 1-18, 20-23 and 25 are pending.

Claim 24 was canceled, without prejudice.

Claim 1 was amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim Applicants' invention. Claim 1 was amended to include the limitations of former Claim 24.

OBJECTIONS TO THE CLAIMS

The Examiner objects to Claims 1-18 and 20-25 on the ground of informalities.

As to Claims 1 and 23, the Examiner states that "A system for a structure, said system for a structure comprising" should be "A system for a structure, said system comprising" to prevent any confusion.

As to Claims 2-18, 20-22, 24 and 25, the Examiner states that "The system for a structure of Claim" should be "The system of Claim" for the same purpose.

It is noted that the Examiner has withdrawn the rejection under Section 112, second paragraph. Applicants' attorney respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's stated positions in the present objection. However, in order to advance the Application to allowance at an early opportunity, Claims 1-18, 20-23 and 25 have been amended to delete the instances of "for a structure" as identified by the Examiner. Therefore, it is submitted that these objections have been obviated.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-18, 20-22, 24 and 25 on the ground of being anticipated by International Publication No. WO 00/75900 A1 (Kligman et al.).

Kligman et al. discloses a wireless security alarm system providing two-way communication through RF transceiver 22 between a main control unit (MCU) 20 and a plurality of peripheral units 40 including both remote sensors 42 and alarm indicators 44.

The MCU 20 also operates in conjunction with a cordless telephone, including a separate telephone base station 11 and a telephone handset 12, allowing the telephone handset 12 to be used as a remote control and a user display for setting alarm functions after installation and displaying system status. The telephone base station 11 has a separate communication channel (Figure 1A shows an antenna separate and distinct from the antenna of the RF transceiver 22, and a separate interface from the telephone base station 11 to the MCU 20). "Each cordless telephone handset 12 communicates with the cordless base station 11 …" (page 11, lines 29-30). A telephone keypad 12a is used for data entry and activation or deactivation of the alarm system. The cordless handset 12 includes a multi-function LCD

display 12c for displaying information, such as caller ID code, called number, and alarm status and messages. The telephone keypad 12a dials the telephone and enters alphanumeric data for programming and setting the alarm system in conjunction with special function buttons 12b. The display 12c provides user information in both the telephone and alarm system modes. The telephone cordless handset 12 "receive[s] data sent by the MCU 20 [through the telephone base station 11] and … display[s] it on the handset display 12c" (page 13, lines 8-9).

A separate key fob remote control 19 serve as an emergency (panic) transmitter and/or keychain remote control. This includes any desired number of control buttons, which enable remote arming/disarming of the security system.

The MCU RF transceiver 22 receives a signal from the peripheral units 40 to indicate an alarm condition and communicates data to the peripheral units 40. The peripheral units 40 used in system can be configured through the MCU 20 upon installation, either directly or from a remote location. During operation, all peripheral sensors 42 are fully supervised by the MCU 20 and report any desired status to the MCU 20 upon occurrence and/or interrogation.

The MCU 20 sends a signal to the sensor 42 requesting a status signal from the sensor 42 to verify an alarm condition. The MCU 20 may also, or alternatively, request a status signal from a neighboring sensor 42. If the activated sensor 42 and/or the neighboring sensor 42 indicates in response to the verification request that no alarm condition exists, then the MCU 20 determines whether the alarm indication was false.

The MCU 20 also includes a communicator 24 for controlling a transfer of data between the system and a remote location over a communications link.

The MCU 20 operates in three modes: Active Mode, in which data is actively being transferred between the MCU 20 and peripheral units 40; Standby Mode, in which the peripheral units 40 are communicating with the MCU 20 periodically solely for maintaining network synchronization and control; and Suspend Mode, in which selected peripheral units 40 are not communicating with the network. In response to an indication of an alarm condition by a sensor, the MCU 20 requests a status signal from the sensor to verify the alarm condition.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a system for a structure comprising: a server including a first wireless communication port; a portable fob including a second wireless communication port, a user input device and a display; and a plurality of sensors, each of the sensors sensing information and including a third wireless communication port, which sends

the sensed information to the first wireless communication port of the server, the server sending the sensed information for at least one of the sensors from the first wireless communication port of the server to the second wireless communication port of the portable fob, the portable fob displaying the sensed information for at least one of the sensors at the display of the portable fob, wherein the server further includes a processor, which detects a state change of the sensed information of one of the sensors, and which sends the state change of the sensed information from the first wireless communication port of the server to the second wireless communication port of the portable fob, wherein the portable fob receives the state change of the sensed information from the second wireless communication port and responsively drives the display, wherein the sensors periodically send the sensed information to the first wireless communication port of the server, and wherein the portable fob periodically requests and receives the sensed information for the sensors between the first and second wireless communication ports.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim. *Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Kligman et al., which employs RF transceiver 22 for communication with peripheral units 40 and a separate cordless telephone base station 11 for communication with cordless telephone handsets 12, does not teach or suggest a sensor sensing information and including a third wireless communication port, which sends such sensed information to a first wireless communication port of a server, and such server sending such sensed information ***from*** such ***first wireless communication port*** of such server to a second wireless communication port of a portable fob.

Furthermore, Kligman et al., which employs RF transceiver 22 and the separate cordless telephone base station 11, also does not teach or suggest a server processor, which detects a state change of sensed information of a sensor, and which sends such state change of such sensed information ***from*** such ***first wireless communication port*** of such server to a second wireless communication port of a portable fob.

These refined recitals reduce the count of communication ports required by the system of Claim 1.

Moreover, Kligman et al., which employs RF transceiver 22 and the separate cordless telephone base station 11, where telephone cordless handset 12 receives data "sent by" MCU 20 through the separate cordless telephone base station 11, further does not teach

or suggest a portable fob that ***periodically requests*** and receives sensed information for sensors between such ***first*** and second ***wireless communication port***s.

This refined recital ensures that the portable fob periodically requests and receives the sensed information rather than receiving whatever data happens to be sent by the MCU 20 of Kligman et al.. No such portable fob employing such a periodic request is taught or suggested by the single cited reference.

Therefore, for any or all of the above reasons, Claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the single cited reference.

Claims 2-18, 20-23 and 25 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 1 and patentably distinguish over the single cited reference for at least the same reasons.

Furthermore, Claim 13 recites that the portable fob is adapted to configure the at least one of the sensors for at least one of: a sensor name and an alert as a function of the sensed information for at least one of the sensors.

It is submitted that Kligman et al. does not teach or suggest that the peripheral sensors 42 are named, much less that any portable fob is adapted to configure a sensor for a ***sensor name***.

It is also submitted that Kligman et al. does not teach or suggest that a portable fob is adapted to configure a sensor for an alert ***as a function of sensed information***.

For example, as set forth at page 17, lines 17-24 of the present specification, the fob screen 226 prompts the user to select one of the sensor awareness levels, for example, "Alert me if opened?" and "Alert me if closed?" and, also, the user can select that an alert as determined by the base station 4 be sounded if the configured sensor is opened or if such sensor is closed.

Kligman et al. discloses that peripheral units 40 can be configured through the MCU 20 upon installation, either directly or from a remote location, but does not teach or suggest the refined recital of a portable fob being adapted to configure a sensor for a sensor name, and does not teach or suggest the refined recital of a portable fob being adapted to configure a sensor for an alert as a function of sensed information for a sensor. Therefore, Claim 13 further patentably distinguishes over the single cited reference.

Claims 17 and 18 are not separately asserted to be patentable except in combination with Claim 1 from which they depend. The single cited reference does not teach or suggest the recited networks formed by a server, sensors and the recited portable fob.

Allowable Subject Matter

It is noted with appreciation that the Examiner states that Claim 23 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the claim objection set forth in the Office Action.

Claim 23 was amended to obviate the claim objection set forth in the Office Action, as was discussed above. Hence, it is submitted that Claim 23 is in condition for allowance.

Summary and Conclusion

In summary, it is submitted that Claims 1-18, 20-23 and 25 are in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration and early allowance are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kirk D. Houser/

Kirk D. Houser
Attorney for Applicants
(412) 566-6083 Registration No. 37,357